THE REMONSTRANCE
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, JULY, 1916

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and forty Branch Committees; 37,467 members in 443 cities, towns, and villages*

MRS. JOSIN BALCH, President
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ, MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY, MISS ANNA L. DAWES, MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD, MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL, MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY — Vice Presidents
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
Walnut Street, Brookline.

Executive Committee
Chairman
MRS. LOUIS A. FROTHINGHAM

Education and Organization Committee
Chairman
MRS. EDWIN FORD

Publicity Committee
Chairman
MRS. A. H. PARKER

Membership Committee
Chairman
MISS JULIA C. PRENDERGAST

Public Interest League
President
MRS. B. L. ROBINSON
Recording Secretary
MRS. RANDOLPH FROTHINGHAM
Corresponding Secretary
MRS. STEPHEN S. FITZGERALD

* *Net present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State*

VICTORY IN IOWA

THE anti-suffrage cause won another splendid victory in Iowa on the 5th of June.

The suffragists seemed to have every advantage in the campaign for the adoption of the woman suffrage amendment to the State Constitution. They were thoroughly organized; they had unlimited funds; they had succeeded in securing the support, sincere or otherwise, of two-thirds of the newspapers in the State; they had more than 500 speakers stumping the State. Moreover, they had persuaded the Legislature to have the vote taken at the primaries, instead of at the regular election in November, thereby gaining the advantage of a relatively light vote. All of the suffrage victories have been won on a light vote—California, Montana, Nevada and Oregon, for example, by majorities of only 3,587, 3,714, 3,676 and 4,161 respectively; and the suffragists counted so confidently on a like result in Iowa that Mrs. Catt announced, shortly before the election, that the anti-suffragists had absolutely no chance. The vote, as anticipated, was a light one—barely three-fifths of that cast at the presidential election four years ago. But the majority against the proposed suffrage amendment was 10,341—a majority more than twice as large as that given for suffrage in either of the four States just mentioned.

The Woman's Journal, after its habit, attributes the suffrage defeat to "the underground machinery of the liquor and vice interests, the corrupt politicians, and 'Big Business,' in the bad sense of the term"; and this in spite of the fact that Mrs. Catt, the National Suffrage president, based her confident predictions upon the entire absence of all these forces, saying: "There are no great cities to defeat us with the graft-ridden politicians and saloon interests."

The conservative men and women of Iowa who, contending against heavy odds, have won this victory, are to be congratulated,—not only that they have averted from their State the evils that attend "women in politics," but that they have helped to check the suffrage movement in other States. It will be remembered that Mrs. Catt herself said, before the Iowa election: "Iowa is a strategic State. If Iowa loses, South Dakota will lose. If Iowa fails, it will be a tremendous blow to the movement in the United States."

AGAINST THE FEDERAL AMENDMENT

THE suffrage plank, adopted by the Republican National Convention at Chicago, is in these words:

"The Republican party, reaffirming its faith in government of the people, by the people, and for the people, favors the extension of suffrage to women as a measure of justice to one-half the adult people of this country, *but recognizes the right of each State to settle the question for itself.*"

This resolution holds out what the politicians describe as "an olive branch" to the suffragists; but it declares plainly against the one thing upon which the two factions of suffragists are agreed—the adoption of the Susan B. Anthony amendment.

It is the function of a national party convention to define the policy of the party upon national questions. It does not assume to express itself upon state issues. In declaring that it is the right of each State to settle the suffrage question for itself, the Republican National Convention deliberately waived responsibility for the issue.

But, incidentally, it defined the course which Republican Senators and Representatives should pursue. If party platforms count for anything, they must be binding upon the party representatives in Congress. From this time on, *any Republican Representative or Senator who votes for a Federal Suffrage Amendment will do so in flat contradiction of the platform of his party.*

AN "ALLEGED WOMAN SUFFRAGE PLANK"

THE REMONSTRANCE cannot be accused of minimizing, for its own purposes, the meaning of the suffrage plank in the national Democratic plat-

form, if it uses the phrase which the president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association applied to it. Immediately after the convention, Mrs. Catt sent out the following official statement:

"No suffragist who was present at the convention today could misinterpret either the speeches or the action taken by the Democratic party in adopting the alleged woman suffrage plank in the national platform.

"The Democrats admitted freely in their speeches that 'political exigency' demanded 'some kind of a suffrage plank,' and they thought to hoodwink the women by a jumble of words that were designed to meet the situation, but in no sense succeeded."

The plank, thus angrily described as "a jumble of words," was as follows: "We favor the extension of the franchise to the women of this country, *state by state,* on the same terms as to the men."

This plank is substantially the same as that adopted by the National Republican Convention at Chicago. Like that, while it extends an olive branch to the suffragists, it declares against the plan, upon which the two suffrage factions are united, of getting suffrage through a Federal Amendment. Miss Ann Martin, chairman of the so-called Woman's Party, said, after the Democratic convention was over:

"We shall return to Washington as quickly as possible. We are going to give the Democratic Congress one more chance to make good before adjournment. If it does not see fit to pass a constitutional amendment, war will follow."

Later in the campaign, the suffragists may be found exulting over a "victory" at St. Louis. In that case, it will be profitable to remember the frank appraisals of the Democratic plank by the leaders of the two suffrage factions.

WHAT PLATFORMS MEAN

EXPERIENCED politicians do not attach overmuch importance to party platforms. They know that they are often framed from considerations of immediate expediency, and are not held as binding upon future party action. For example, the National Democratic Convention at Baltimore in July, 1912, made the following declaration:

"We favor a single Presidential term, and to that end urge the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution making the President of the United States ineligible for re-election, *and we pledge the candidate of this convention to this principle.*"

This plank went further than most platform declarations in definitely pledging the candidate, in advance of his acceptance of the nomination. Yet neither President Wilson nor the Democratic convention saw any inconsistency in his re-nomination at St. Louis. This suggests how widely party action may depart from party platforms.

SUFFRAGE AND THE BABIES

THE Woman's Journal has discovered a new reason for exulting over the beneficent results of woman suffrage.

In its issue for June 10, it printed an article with these headlines: "Suffrage Saving Lives of Babies—Since Kansas Became Free, Infant Mortality Has Dropped 36 Per Cent." Under these headlines was the following statement:

"Since Kansas became a suffrage state, infant mortality in Topeka has been reduced over 36 per cent. Previous to the adoption of woman suffrage, infant mortality had been a serious problem in Topeka. Owing to bad sanitary conditions in certain parts of the city, babies had perished in great numbers during summer months. The first summer following, the Public Nursing Association was created and infant mortality was reduced appreciably."

It appears from this that the reduced rate of infant mortality has not taken place throughout the State, but only in the city of Topeka; and that it is due there, not to suffrage nor to any political causes, but to a non-political pure-milk campaign, like those waged so successfully in New York and other cities.

The work of the Public Nursing Association in Topeka, which has had such good results in saving baby lives, has been carried on for only two or three years. But what about the bad sanitary conditions, to which The Woman's Journal alludes? Who was responsible for them? Does The Journal forget, or does it hope that its readers may have forgotten, that women had had the municipal vote in Topeka for more than twenty-five years before the Public Nursing Association was formed to relieve the bad sanitary conditions which the women voters had suffered to be continued, year after year?

That The Journal should try to make this quarter of a century of neglect by the women voters of Topeka, relieved at last by private philanthropy, an argument for woman suffrage, suggests a curious perversity of reasoning.

TEMPERANCE AND SUFFRAGE

AT the city and town elections in Illinois in April, according to despatches in the New York Evening Post (suffragist), the results were about equally balanced, "dry" gains in certain places being offset by "wet" gains in others. Taking the State as a whole, "votes for women" appear to have had no appreciable influence upon the result.

But at the April elections in South Dakota, according to the same authority, the cause of local prohibition gained heavily. No less than fourteen cities and towns transferred themselves from the "wet" to the "dry" column, and not a single "dry" city or town was won by the "wets."

In view of these facts, it will be pretty hard to convince South Dakota voters next November that they will promote the cause of temperance by giving the ballot to women.

THE ANNUAL MEETING

THE Annual Meeting of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts was held at the Hotel Brunswick, Boston, April 27.

The meeting was called to order by the president, Mrs. John Balch. Mrs. James M. Codman, treasurer, read her report for the year. Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, chairman of the Education and Organization Committee, reported 137 Branch Committees in the State, and a net membership of 36,880. Seven hundred and ninety-two meetings were held during the year, in addition to automobile tours by speakers and small meetings held by branches. Unprecedented requests for literature had been received from all parts of the country, and an enormous amount of material had been sent out for debates, and to libraries and colleges. Mrs. Thomas Allen, as organizing chairman of the College Anti-Suffrage League of Massachusetts, spoke of the plans of the League, and asked the co-operation of all college women. A vote of thanks was then given the President for her splendid work in leading the Association to victory last autumn.

In the absence of Mrs. B. L. Robinson, its president, who was in Iowa, the report of the Public Interests League was read by the secretary, Mrs. Gulick. Over $500 was raised by the League for the Red Cross Sewing Headquarters at 685 Boylston Street; $100 was sent to Mrs. Humphrey Ward in response to her appeal for school centres in England, the money being raised by lectures given by Mademe Dupriez, under the auspices of the League. A Food Booth was held at the Polish Bazaar for three days, netting over $1,000. Much work has been done for the new Immigrant Station at Boston, and money is now being raised for the care of French orphans during the war. Six dollars a month provides for a child; and already a number of branches have undertaken the support of one or more orphans. Plans are now being formed for work among the foreign populations to educate them in the duties of good citizenship.

Mrs. A. H. Parker, Mrs. Ford and Mrs. Balch reported upon the anti-suffrage work in Iowa, and Mrs. Balch spoke of the campaign and victory in Massachusetts, and paid a tribute to the memory of Miss Elizabeth H. Houghton, whose death deprived the Association of a valued friend and helper.

The following officers and the executive board were re-elected:

President, Mrs. John Balch; vice-presidents, Mrs. George R. Agassiz, Mrs. Robert S. Bradley, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Robert S. Russell, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney; treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman.

THE CONGRESSIONAL UNION CRUSADE

THE SUFFRAGIST, the organ of the Congressional Union, professes to believe that "by putting suffrage first and party affiliations second, women can make the suffrage issue a deciding factor in the next presidential campaign." "Even a small group of women," it says, "determined to stand out for the long-delayed enfranchisement of their sex throughout the nation, can form the balance of power and can demand and secure the immediate passage through Congress of the Susan B. Anthony amendment."

In support of this statement, The Suffragist proceeds to indulge in mathematical calculations. Seven per cent. this, ten per cent. that, twelve per cent. the other, and so on, and the thing is done.

What The Suffragist seems to forget, or at least thinks best should be forgotten, is that the organization which it represents tried this very experiment only two years ago, and the results were not at all what had been mathematically figured out.

The Congressional Union, in 1914, declared its intention of defeating Democratic candidates for Congress from the suffrage states, simply because they were Democrats and as a rebuke and chastening to the Democratic party. Miss Alice Paul, the leader of the Union, announced:

"We are going to make it plain that it is political suicide for any party to ignore our demands or oppose our cause. We think we will make such a conclusive showing in the nine suffrage states that no party after that will oppose us."

So, with a wild beating of drums, the Congressional Union orators and organizers traversed the nine suffrage states, campaigning against all Democratic candidates for the Senate and House, regardless of their individual attitude on suffrage. And what was the "conclusive showing" of this campaign? In these nine states there were three Democratic Senators who were candidates for re-election, and there were thirteen seats in the House filled by Democrats. The three Senators were all re-elected; and thirteen Democrats were elected to the House. While in the country at large the Democratic party lost heavily—its majority in the House being reduced from 147 to 22—it held its own in the nine states in which the Congressional Union had announced its intention to "discipline" it.

In view of these facts, the present crusade of the Congressional Union will be regarded with composure by those against whom it is aimed.

ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS will be glad to learn that Mrs. Thomas Allen, a prominent Anti-Suffrage leader, is in charge of the organization of The College Anti-Suffrage League of Massachusetts. Already much enthusiasm has been awakened in this most important work. Mrs. Allen requests the hearty and active co-operation of all Anti-Suffragists who are college graduates and of those who have attended college, if only for a year or two, and asks that names and addresses be sent to her at 12 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston.

ANOTHER BLOW AT SUFFRAGE

THE Supreme Court of Illinois has dealt another blow at the suffrage law in that State.

Mention was made in the April REMONSTRANCE of the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court that women had no right to vote for precinct, ward and state committeemen, or for delegates to national conventions. This decision was disappointing to the suffragists, but it did not involve any vital point in the law. The ruling of the Court turned upon the fact that delegates to national conventions are not nominated, but elected, at the primaries, and that there was nothing in the Act in question which gave women the right to vote in such an election.

The decision of the Court in the latest case is of much greater importance. The case came before the Court from the city of Macomb, where city judge Franklin was a candidate for re-election, and was opposed by a woman candidate, Miss Josie Westfall. Counting the votes of men and women, Miss Westfall had a plurality of about 300; but, counting only the votes of men, Franklin received 430 votes and Miss Westfall 409. The decision of the Supreme Court was that only the men's votes should have been counted, and that Franklin therefore was elected by a plurality of 21. The decision turned upon the point that all courts are either directly or indirectly created by the judicial article of the Constitution, and that it is therefore beyond the power of the Legislature to grant women the right to vote for them. This decision applies to the municipal court of Chicago as well as to the courts of down-state cities.

A peculiar significance attaches to this decision because of the way in which the judges "lined up" upon it. It will be remembered that the original decision of the Court, sustaining the constitutionality of the Act, was given by a vote of four to three. The fourth judge, whose vote decided the case for the suffragists, had been elected after a heated campaign, in which the suffragists took an active part, for the undisguised purpose of defeating the sitting judge, who was a candidate for re-election, because he was suspected of anti-suffrage leanings. In the original decision, Justices Carter, Cartwright, Dunn and Vickers voted to sustain the constitutionality of the Act; Justices Cooke, Craig and Farmer voted against doing so.

The latest decision is also by a vote of four to three. Justice Vickers died in office, and was succeeded by Justice Warren W. Duncan. The other six justices divided exactly as in the original decision of June, 1914. It was Justice Duncan who gave the deciding vote against the suffragist contention.

This decision and the vote by which it was given suggest the possibility—not to say probability—that the entire Act may be pronounced unconstitutional, if the issue is brought before the Court. It is well known that other contests are on their way to the Court, some of which may involve the entire Act. That the suffragists are apprehensive of what may happen in such a case is clear from the admission of Helen Stewart, 2nd vice-president of the Illinois Equal Suffrage Association, who, writing in the Woman's Journal of February 26 concerning the decision regarding delegates to national conventions, said, as quoted in the April REMONSTRANCE, "We did not feel it at all wise to allow the matter of our whole bill to be brought up before the Supreme Court, even for the sake of voting for the important offices that were in question at this time." Mrs. Stewart will feel this strategy abundantly justified, in view of the latest decision; but it will not be at the option of the suffragists, in later cases, to determine what they will or will not "allow" to come before the Court. Sooner or later—and the sooner the better—the entire Act must be passed upon.

DO WOMEN WANT THE VOTE?

THIS is the simple question put by State Senator William M. Bray of Wisconsin in the leading article in the Atlantic Monthly for April.

It was a practical question for him. He was a member of the Legislature upon which Wisconsin suffragists were bringing every possible pressure to bear for the resubmission of the suffrage amendment which had been heavily defeated at the polls only two years before. It was his belief that if a majority of the women wanted the ballot they should have it; but did a majority want it? Practically all women who said anything to him about suffrage wanted to vote, and told him so in no uncertain terms. But did they represent their sex? He found very few suffrage advocates who were interested in this question. They generally argued that suffragists should be given the ballot even if most women were opposed to it. And when he asked of them such questions as, "Don't you think women who are opposed to suffrage have 'rights'?", or "Are you fair in trying to force duties and responsibilities upon all women, without regard to whether or not they want them, in order to secure 'rights' for suffragists?", or "If women are well enough informed to exercise the right of suffrage, are they not sufficiently intelligent to decide whether they want suffrage?" he got little satisfaction.

To relieve his perplexity, he arranged for a canvass of the women in his district. He could not afford to poll the whole district, but he canvassed half of it, selecting the most representative precincts, and sending out through impartial canvassers, printed ballots upon which the women approached could register their views, without discussion and without publicity. Less than two per cent. of the women refused to indicate where they stood. Altogether, nearly eight thousand votes were polled; and the results indicated that

fully two-thirds of all the women in his district were opposed to suffrage. In his own ward, where most of the women were wives of workingmen, they voted against suffrage, four to one. Another workingmen's ward voted in the same ratio; two others voted three to one. In a ward where the residents represented all classes, two-thirds of the vote was No. In the largest ward in the city, eight hundred workingmen's wives marked the ballots, and seven out of eight had not wanted women to vote.

When he came to poll the women whom his canvassers had not found at home—the working women in factories, stores, schools and other places—he found that most teachers, older scholars, librarians, nurses and dressmakers voted "Yes," while a large majority of bookkeepers, stenographers, clerks, factory girls and hotel employees voted "No." The rural districts proved to be almost as strongly opposed to suffrage as the cities; and not a single ward, city or village in the district returned a majority for suffrage.

THE REMONSTRANCE confidently predicts that any hesitating legislator or congressman in Massachusetts or elsewhere, who will make a like canvass of the women in his district, will obtain similar results. All that anti-suffragists ask of men in any State upon whom the responsibility rests of deciding the question of woman suffrage is that they shall ask the women what they want and vote accordingly.

"THE WAYS OF WOMAN"

MISS IDA M. TARBELL'S latest book, "The Ways of Woman," published by the Macmillan Co., supplements her previous work on "The Business of Being a Woman." Written in her usual terse, vigorous and practical style, it defends the old ideals, while it recognizes sympathetically the new problems which confront women today.

Miss Tarbell makes short work of some of the delusions and misapprehensions which underlie the suffrage agitation. She shows from census statistics that the number of women in industry has been greatly exaggerated; that their average term of employment is short; that, so far from its being true that marriage is going out of fashion, women are marrying more freely than they did twenty or thirty years ago; and that "there is no other human relation that can show anything like so large a statistical proof of success" as marriage. These assertions, it will be noticed, run counter to many of the suffrage arguments, but Miss Tarbell sustains them by authoritative statistics.

In the chapter entitled "That's Her Business," Miss Tarbell sets forth the broadening and developing influence of woman's home responsibilities with an effectiveness that recalls Chesterton's famous presentation of the same thought. Of the training that develops ability to meet emergencies she says: "There is no human experience which offers greater opportunities for it than that of women in their family relations. . . . Whatever the experiments they make, they will never find a substitute for their ancient school."

WORKING UNDER COVER

"There are so many 'antis' now that, whatever we do, we must do in a very underhand way." This is the sentiment which a leading Massachusetts suffragist was recently heard expressing, as she came out from a Symphony Concert.

It fits in pretty well with Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt's injunction, at the Annual Convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association, which, with approving editorial comment, is quoted below from The Woman's Journal:

"Mrs. Catt also advised the women to keep their plans to themselves, and not let them come to the knowledge of the enemy. 'Suffragists are often very leaky,' she said. 'They will actually talk as they go down in the elevator about the plan of campaign that has been adopted at their meeting.'

"The editor of the Journal would remind the suffragists of all the states that the opponents of suffrage read this paper with a lynx eye, in order to find out what is going on in the way of suffrage work, and to counteract it, if possible. Do not send us for publication any news that you are not perfectly willing to have the enemy know."

It is plain, therefore, that the president of the National Woman Suffrage Association and the editor of its organ are agreed in favor of carrying on suffrage activities secretly. There will be as little open work as possible, if they have their way, and presumably they will. They will work underground, and behind cover, in the hope of repeating their success in Illinois in getting through the Legislature, by a secret lobby, a measure which would have been rejected by the voters by a two to one majority, if it had been submitted at the polls.

Forewarned is forearmed. The definite announcement of this policy of secrecy should put anti-suffragists everywhere on their guard against suffrage attempts to get by stealth what they know they cannot get in the open.

THE latest suffrage argument—see the editorial page of The Woman's Journal of May 13—is that female dogs have shown themselves better message carriers than male dogs on the French battlefields. At least, the Paris correspondent of the Pall Mall Gazette so reports. Whereupon, The Woman's Journal remarks joyously: "Somehow, the mental and moral inferiority of the female does not show itself conspicuously among the lower animals." Has Miss Blackwell, whose initials are appended to this argument, no sense of humor?

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association, KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615, 687 Boylston Street.
Selected Packages, 25c.

FEMINIST FALLACIES

THE most searching arraignment yet made of the suffragist-feminist movement is to be found in the volume entitled "Feminism: Its Fallacies and Follies," written by Mr. and Mrs. John Martin and published by Dodd, Mead & Co. ($1.50 net.)

The first half of the book presents the subject from the man's point of view, the second from the woman's; and both go to prove the logical connection between woman suffrage and the more radical industrial and sex feminism. Mr. Martin begins with a suggestive chapter on "Feminism versus Humanism," indicating a contrast of essential principles, which he illustrates by concrete examples in the following chapters on "The Industrial Subjugation of Woman" and "The Humanist Industrial Programme for Women." He exposes with special clearness the fallacy of "Equal Pay for Men and Women," touches on "Feminism and Free Love," and gives some startling statistics in the chapters on "The Woman's Movement and the Baby Crop," and "The Fading of the Maternal Instinct." The motto of Humanism he expresses aptly in the phrase "Homes for Women" as against the suffrage cry of "Votes for Women"; and he indicates his own ideals briefly in the chapters, "Humanist Education for Women," "Woman's Work in the Autumn of Life," and "Woman's Deepest Wrongs and the Humanist Remedy." They include, for colleges, courses differentiated from men's, with year-books recording in a place of honor the children born to women graduates, reunions for mother-graduates, the substitution of mature matrons for spinsters among the faculty, as well as the teaching of domestic science in the broadest sense of the term. In legislation, his ideal calls for "communal changes, vast and varied, to ensure that every mother in the home shall be free from anxiety," including compulsory rest from industrial employment, consulting dispensaries, provision of pure milk, maternity insurance, and the raising of wages for fathers. Mr. Martin's style is direct and pungent; his temper is tolerant; his opinions combine the conservative and progressive; and his chapters are full of information.

Mrs. Martin's presentation of the subject, from the woman's point of view, deals more in epigram. She writes piquantly out of her own observation of the effect on family life of the woman's college, the professional career for women, the apartment house, hotel life, etc. She attacks slashingly the utterances of W. L. George, Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, and other writers of the suffragist-feminist school, and devotes an interesting chapter to a dispassionate analysis of Ellen Key. In another chapter she exposes the familiar fallacy of the feminists that woman has now "nothing to do in the home."

The book is an arsenal of facts and arguments. Not the least valuable feature of it is found in the direct quotations from suffragist-feminist writers, showing that they aim at a day when no wives will be supported by husbands, when divorce will be easy and when the home will be swept away and the family destroyed.

IN NEW YORK

THE suffragists are exultant because they succeeded in inducing the New York Legislature to approve the Whitney-Brereton resolution, providing for the resubmission of the suffrage amendment. THE REMONSTRANCE ventures to predict that they will be a good deal less exultant when the votes are counted in November, 1917—provided that next year's Legislature votes to force the issue again upon the voters.

The New York suffragists are making the same error as the Ohio suffragists. The Ohio voters rejected the suffrage amendment in 1912 by a majority of 87,455. The suffragists were not content, but insisted on having the proposition voted on again in 1914. They were accommodated. And what was the result? The amendment was defeated by a majority of 182,905. Since then, the Ohio suffragists have kept rather quiet.

In New York, last year, the proposed suffrage amendment was defeated by a majority which fell only 16 votes short of 195,000. Every Assembly district in the State except eleven voted No. The 109 Assemblymen who voted for resubmission did not represent their constituents, and they are likely to find out what their constituents think of them. The popular impatience with the suffrage unwillingness to accept the clearly-expressed will of the voters will have a chance to express itself quite as emphatically as in Ohio.

Meanwhile, it is interesting to notice the sort of tactics which the suffragists used. On the day of the debate in the Assembly, as soon as the opponents began to speak, a band engaged by the suffragists played noisily beneath the Assembly windows in the street below to drown the voices of the speakers. There were repeated interruptions from the galleries and the Speaker found it hard to preserve order. Here is the New York Herald's report of what happened when the question was before the Senate Judiciary Committee:

"Senator Gilchrist came out of the Judiciary Committee room at the end of the hearing. He was surrounded by a score or more women, who "demanded" to know why action had not been taken.

" 'For your own good I will tell you that the Senate does not like your methods here,' the Senator said.

" 'Get a rope' and 'Chloroform him,' shouted the suffrage enthusiasts.' "

Such incidents are useful as a demonstration of the suffrage temper, but they do not further the suffrage cause.

SUFFRAGE AND FEMINISM

Some of the more sagacious suffrage leaders appear to be awakening to a sense of the injury which the close affiliation of extreme feminists is doing to the suffrage cause. In very much the same spirit in which they affirm that, while all Socialists are suffragists, all suffragists are not Socialists, they insist that, while all feminists are suffragists it is a cruel injustice to say that all suffragists are feminists. There is some force in this contention, but it is too much to expect the public at large to understand at precisely what point such an affiliation ends. When extreme feminists are given a conspicuous place in suffrage leadership and upon suffrage platforms, it is not surprising that they should be looked upon as representing, if not the present status of the movement, its drift and tendency.

The San Francisco Argonaut, a leading paper in a suffrage state, in its attempt to explain the unexpectedly large majorities by which the four large eastern states rejected woman suffrage last fall, said:

"The reason is probably to be sought in the excesses of which so many of the leaders have been guilty, and in the still greater excesses that have attended the wider campaign of what is known as the Feminist Movement in general. It may be argued that the majority of the agitating women want the vote, and nothing but the vote, and that they ought not to be identified with a propaganda that seems to lay the axe at the root of the ordinary and universally accepted principles of morality. There is something to be said for such a contention, and still more might be said if there had been any real protest from moderate women who asked for no more than an equality in the electoral rights of citizenship. But there has been no such protest. Magazines, newspapers and the public platform have been deluged with appeals and assertions of so unblushing a kind as to disgrace a saloon bar, and it is small wonder that the public should fail to draw the line between a demand for the vote and a demand for sex license. Comparatively few women have been guilty of these grosser excesses either in word or thought. But a very large number have been guilty of silence."

This indictment is well grounded. It is the very large number of suffrage women who have been guilty of silence who must carry most of the responsibility for the identification of suffragism with feminism in the public mind.

"THE EDEN SPHINX"

One of the most piquant and pungent contributions to the discussion of the woman question is Mrs. Annie Riley Hale's "The Eden Sphinx." The chapter headings convey a good idea of its scope: The Nature of Woman; Woman's Rights and Wrongs; The Suffragette Intellect; The Male Suffragist and the Case for the Antis; Our Debt to the Feminist; New Woman or New Mother?

Mrs. Hale's purpose, as she defines it, is to point out that woman is the weak link in the human chain, and that her weakness is due to lack of development; and to protest against the modern heresy that woman needs masculine training for her development. Her book is singularly stimulating and suggestive, and it is written out of a wide contact with human nature and an unusual familiarity with the literature of the subject. Mrs. Hale's review of the theory of "economic independence" is especially caustic, and there is both eloquence and common sense in her presentation of "woman's job."

Readers of The Remonstrance who would like to possess themselves of this keen and challenging book can do so at the headquarters of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, 615 Kensington Building, Boston.

SOON TIRED OF IT

A San Francisco pastor, addressing the women of his congregation after the last election, at which, on a light vote, a satisfactory Board of School Supervisors had been displaced by an inferior body, said: "You women came to us with tears in your eyes, asking us for the ballot, and now that we have given it to you, you will not use it."

A similar rebuke might well be addressed to Illinois suffragists who, in many instances, are making but a feeble and futile use of the ballot. This was especially true at the municipal election in April. In Chicago, for example, the Church Federation issued a special appeal, declaring that many moral issues were now challenging the best thought of the citizens, and that "To neglect to vote is a betrayal that amounts almost to treason to this republic." Yet only 139,699 women—19 per cent. of the women of voting age—went to the polls. This was the smallest number since women were given the municipal vote by the Act of 1913. It was but a little more than half of the women's vote in 1915. Of the 28 candidates endorsed by the "wets," all but five were elected. Of the three parties contesting for offices, the Socialists gained 85 per cent., while the Republicans and Democrats lost heavily.

The most significant incident of the Mississippi Valley Suffrage Conference, held at Minneapolis in May, was the flat refusal of the Conference to endorse the movement for a Federal suffrage amendment. Miss Laura Clay of Kentucky told the Conference that the idea of such an amendment was "a dream," and that, even if it passed Congress, there was little likelihood that the necessary number of states would adopt it. And Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt frankly told the Conference not to deceive itself into believing that the suffragists were going to get the suffrage amendment from the present Congress. "Notwithstanding all the optimistic chatter you hear," she told the Conference, "just set it down that we are not." She was criticised for her candor, but every one present must have known that she told the truth.

JUDGE LINDSEY'S CORRECTIONS

In The Woman's Journal for May 6, Judge Lindsey complains that he has been misrepresented by anti-suffragists. As to his speech at the Savoy Hotel in Denver, in January, 1915, in which he was reported to have said that Colorado was twenty years behind Massachusetts in child labor laws and laws for the protection of women, he explains that it was an adult probation law of which he was speaking, and with regard to which he admitted the inferiority of Colorado. He complains that his book, "The Beast and the Jungle," has been distorted and misrepresented, but he gives no definite instances, and it is perhaps just as well that he does not, for he is on record there, in black and white, as to conditions in Colorado. By way of apology, he now says that these conditions have existed in Colorado not because of woman suffrage but in spite of it. That they are now being eliminated he attributes to woman suffrage; but "votes for women" must be an extremely slow corrective if it takes twenty-three years for them to begin to make themselves felt.

Judge Lindsey complains that he has been quoted as saying, when testifying in November, 1914, before the Federal Industrial Relations Committee, in New York City, that "the Supreme Court of Colorado was so corrupt that it was owned and controlled by the corporations as they own and control their office boys." He quotes from the official record of his testimony as follows:

"I know whereof I speak when I say to you that they have owned judges (including Supreme Judges) on the bench as they have owned their office boys; that they have controlled those judges, that they have controlled district attorneys; that they have controlled governors; that they have been in the most perfidious deals to control the agencies and officers of the law time and time again, so that they not only make the law to suit their own wishes, primarily, but, though they do not always do it, to protect property and stand against the rights of humanity."

Judge Lindsey now explains that the foregoing testimony had no reference to the present Supreme Court, but to "a former period in politics, and especially conditions in certain of the coal counties where few women vote." This explanation may make Judge Lindsey's relations more agreeable with the present Supreme Court; but it does not do away with the fact that the conditions which he portrayed so vividly existed many years after Colorado women were given the vote. To say, as he does, that they existed "'in spite of the women" is only to follow the familiar suffragist policy of claiming anything that is good in suffrage states as the result of women's votes, and insisting that everything evil exists in spite of them.

Last year, nation-wide attention was directed, in connection with the Panama Exposition, to the shocking moral conditions officially tolerated in San Francisco. This year, conditions equally shocking are under investigation in Chicago; and it is generally admitted that these two cities are the worst in the country in these respects. Yet, in both of them, the "purifying influence" of women has been exercised at the ballot box for several years.

The feud between the Congressional Union and the National Woman Suffrage Association extends even to the matter of hats. The official party hat of the Union is a "combination of white silk and braid, set off with a rosette of purple, white and gold." It can be had for $5.00, and loyal adherents to the Union are urged to wear no other millinery. But the official hat of the National Association is a white straw hat, with a yellow band.

Among the minor recent disappointments of the suffragists is their failure to persuade the Louisiana Legislature to submit the proposed woman suffrage amendment to the voters; and the course of the National House of Representatives in first slipping a woman suffrage clause into the pending Porto Rico bill, in Committee of the Whole, and quickly slipping it out again, as soon as the bill emerged from committee.

Was it altogether tactful in Mrs. Catt, in her address before the Mississippi Valley Suffrage Conference at Minneapolis, to say that half of the present Congress are "owned" by some one? To a mere outside observer, that does not seem the best way to conciliate reluctant Congressmen.

ANTI-SUFFRAGE ESSAYS BY MASSACHUSETTS WOMEN

With an Introduction by Ernest Bernbaum, Ph.D. (Harvard University)

Who the Massachusetts Anti-Suffragists Are — **Mrs. John Balch**

The Ballot and the Women in Industry — **Mrs. Henry Preston White**

A Business Woman's View of Suffrage — **Edith Melvin**

Some Practical Aspects of the Question — **Ellen Mudge Burrill**

How Massachusetts Fosters Public Welfare — **Monica Foley**

Massachusetts Compared with Suffrage States — **Catherine Robinson**

Woman Suffrage and War — **Mrs. Charles P. Strong**

Woman Suffrage vs. Womanliness — **Mrs. Thomas Allen**

Suffrage and the School Teacher — **Elizabeth Jackson**

Suffrage and the Social Worker — **Dorothy Godfrey Wayman**

Woman Suffrage a Menace to Social Reform — **Margaret C. Robinson**

The Anti-Suffrage Ideal — **Mrs. Herbert Lyman**

The True Function of the Normal Woman — **Mrs. Horace A. Davis**

The Imperative Demand Upon Women in the Home — **Mrs. Charles Burton Gulick**

Suffrage and the Sex Problem — **Mrs. William Lowell Putnam**

Suffrage a Step Toward Feminism — **Lily Rice Foxcroft**

Price, $1.00 per copy.

On Sale at Headquarters of Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, 687 Boylston St., Boston.